

II. Amendments to the Drawings

Please amend the drawings as follows:

In Figure 5, reference numbers 20, 21, and 23 have been added.

III. Remarks

Claims 1-9 stand rejected. Claims 1, 4, and 6-9 are being amended and claims 3 and 5 are being cancelled. Reconsideration and re-examination of this application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks is herein requested.

The claim language of claim 1 has been amended to more clearly recite the claimed invention as disclosed in the subject application. Claim 1 now recites a bolt having a shank terminating with an axially extending projection for receiving an end cap mounted on the shank and configured to be rotatable about the axis of the bolt. Details of the yieldable formation of the end cap are also recited. Amended claim 1 further recites the threaded shank being configured to engage the threaded bore when an axial pressure is applied to the fastener. No new matter has been added by these amendments.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

Responsive to the rejections of claims 1-4 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,356,255 to Takahashi et al. (*Takahashi*), *Takahashi* does not teach each and every element of the claimed invention. For example, claim 1 recites a fastening comprising a bolt having a threaded shank and an end cap mounted on the shank, the end cap having a yieldable formation to engage frictionally with the threaded bore. In use, the fastener becomes engaged with a threaded aperture by inserting the end cap into the threaded aperture and subsequently applying axial pressure to the bolt of the fastener to engage the threaded shank with the threaded aperture.

Contrarily, *Takahashi* fails to teach a fastener comprising an end cap having a yieldable formation to engage frictionally with a threaded bore. Rather, *Takahashi* teaches a polymeric plug or blocking member of a threaded bore of a nut. The polymeric plug is part of a nut and panel assembly and is used to mask a threaded bore of a nut during a coating process to prevent the coating material from entering into the threaded bore and adhering to the surfaces of the threads. (col. 7, lines 15-18). When the bolt is threaded into the threaded aperture, the polymeric plug is gradually pushed out of the threaded bore by the bolt. (col. 5, lines 11-12). The polymeric plug may serve as a seal if the nut is not filled with a bolt during later assembly. (col. 7, lines 37-40). Moreover, the polymeric plug may be easily removed if desired following coating. (col. 4, lines 33-34). Thus, the polymeric plug and the bolt do not cooperatively engage with the threaded bore, nor is the polymeric plug mounted on the free end of a bolt as part of a fastener which frictionally engages with the threaded bore. Accordingly, *Takahashi* fails to teach a fastener for installation into a threaded bore comprising a bolt having a shank and an end cap mounted on the shank, the end cap having a yieldable formation to engage frictionally with the threaded bore as recited in claim 1.

Since *Takahashi* does not teach each and every element of claim 1, reconsideration of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) and the allowance of claim 1 are respectfully requested. Further, since claims 2 and 4 depend from claim 1, the reasons for allowance of claim 1 apply as well to the dependent claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 5-7 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Takahashi* in view of U.S. Patent No. 3,466,699 to (*Brown*).

Claims 8-9 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Takahashi* in view of *Brown* and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,306,098 to Lewis (*Lewis*). Claim 5 has been cancelled. Claims 6-9 directly depend from claim 1. As stated above, *Takahashi* does not teach or suggest all of the elements of claim 1 and neither *Brown* nor *Lewis* teach or suggest elements to cure *Takahashi*'s deficiencies. Thus, claims 6-9 are allowable for at least the reasons provided above. Accordingly, reconsideration of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) and the allowance of claims 6-9 are respectfully requested.

Conclusion

In view of the above remarks, it is respectfully submitted that pending claims 1, 2, 4, and 6-9 are patentably distinguishable over the art of record. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections.

Respectfully submitted,

January 4, 2008

Date

/Eric J. Sosenko/

Eric J. Sosenko (Reg. No. 34,440)